

Comment Letter CSPA

CSPA



California Sportfishing Protection Alliance

"An Advocate for Fisheries, Habitat and Water Quality"

3536 Rainier Avenue, Stockton, CA 95204

Tel: 209-464-5090, Fax: 209-464-5174, E: deltakeep@aol.com

7 February 2005

Feb 07, 2006 00135

Mr. Paul A. Marshall
Department of Water Resources
South Delta Branch, Draft EIS/EIR Comments
1416 9th Street, 2nd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Via email to: marshall@water.ca.gov and sdip_comments@water.ca.gov

RE: CSPA Comments on the South Delta Improvements Program, Draft
Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report

Dear Mr. Marshall:

The California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, San Joaquin Audubon and Watershed Enforcers (hereinafter, CSPA) submit the following comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (DEIS/R) of November 2005, by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the US Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) concerning the South Delta Improvements Program (SDIP). We incorporate by reference the comments submitted by the Planning and Conservation League, Northern California Counsel of the Federation of Fly Fishers, Friends of Trinity River, California Trout and Richard Izmarian. We also incorporate the attached comments concerning the inadequacies of the DEIS/R's assessment of water quality impacts by Drs. G. Fred Lee and Ann Jones-Lee (Attachment 1).

The environmental assessments for virtually every previous significant project in the Delta have promised benign or beneficial effects. All exacerbated existing conditions. It is frankly astonishing that, in the midst of attempts to understand the causes of the collapse of the Delta's pelagic fisheries, DWR has proposed significantly increased export pumping accompanied by a major modification of the hydrologic regime in the south Delta on the basis of a seriously flawed, inadequate and legally deficient document. That DWR and BOR are aggressively pushing this project at a time when numerous species in the Delta are in precipitous decline, with several hovering on the brink of extinction, speaks volumes about the values and intentions of its proponents.

The Administrative Record for the SDIP must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and carry out the statutory duty to provide decision-makers and the general public with a clear understanding of the consequences of the project.

An EIR is “an environmental ‘alarm bell’ whose purpose it is to alert the public and its responsible officials to environmental changes *before* they have reached ecological points of no return.” *Village Laguna of Laguna Beach, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors* (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 1022, 1027 (emphasis added). Beginning with its artificial segmentation of the proposed project through to its failure to evaluate a reasonable range of project alternatives, the DEIS/R fails to provide an accurate depiction of the many significant environmental impacts that will result from approval of the SDIP. The massive length of the DEIS/R does not reflect a depth of environmental analysis, but instead impedes a comprehensive understanding of the project’s impacts. This letter details some, but not all, of the inadequacies in the DEIS/R, which include:

- The document is based upon the “Biological Opinion (BO) on the Long-Term Central Valley Project (CVP) and State Water Project (SWP) Operations Criteria and Plan (OCAP)”, which has been found faulty by an independent technical review team convened by the CALFED Bay-Delta Program whose findings were made public January 3, 2006. (Attachment 2) A report by the Department of Commerce’s Inspector General also found the BO process violated government procedures (Attachment 3).
- The document does not consider an alternative that **reduces** exports from the Delta, per the Third District Court of Appeals Decision (RCRC et al v State of California, Attachment 4), which sets aside the CALFED PEIR because the PEIR improperly fails to discuss an alternative that requires reduced exports of water from the Delta.¹
- Similar to the CALFED PEIR and the Third District Court of Appeals Decision (RCRC et al v State of California), the document does not adequately disclose the environmental impacts of diverting water from various potential sources to meet the CALFED Program’s goals. In particular, the analysis of impacts to upstream reservoirs, upstream river fisheries and upstream recreation are not only inadequate, but grossly misleading.
- The larger CALFED program, which includes SDIP, CVP long-term contract renewal, the so-called “Napa Proposal” and other elements to integrate CVP and SWP operations requires an EIS/EIR which amends the 1986 Coordinated Operating Agreement between DWR and BOR to include the regulatory baseline as it exists today prior making long term, potentially irretrievable, commitments of natural resources by building the barrier program in the Delta.
- The SDIP DEIS/EIR is premature in assuming that ever-larger deliveries of water to the San Luis Unit of the CVP can be justified, as the ROD for the San Luis Unit Drainage Re-Evaluation has not been completed. The National Economic

¹ Although the Supreme Court recently granted review of this case, the reasoning and conclusions of the Court are based on well-established CEQA law.

Analysis for that project identified that land retirement would be the most cost effective alternative, which could actually allow for **reduced** Delta exports.

Based on myriad inadequacies, prudence and a decent respect for the Delta Estuary we recommend that DWR and BOR withdraw the proposed DEIS/R for this project. We also request that the comment period be extended another 30 days in order to allow adequate time to review this complex and lengthy document.

I. The DEIS/R Improperly Defines the Proposed Project.

In order for an EIR to adequately evaluate the environmental ramifications of a project, it must first provide a comprehensive description of the project itself. "An accurate, stable and finite project description is the *sine qua non* of an informative and legally sufficient EIR." *San Joaquin Raptor/Wildlife Rescue Center v. County of Stanislaus* (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 713, 730 (quoting *County of Inyo v. City of Los Angeles* (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 185, 193). As a result, courts have found that even if an EIR is adequate in all other respects, the use of a "truncated project concept" violates CEQA and mandates the conclusion that the lead agency did not proceed in the manner required by law. *San Joaquin Raptor*, 27 Cal. App. 4th at 729-30. In particular, an inadequate project description hinders the evaluation of project alternatives in violation of CEQA.

The proposed South Delta Improvement Program, which has been promoted as a comprehensive solution to problems in the South Delta, and described as such in the CalFed Delta Improvements Plan, is arbitrarily divided into two stages:

Stage 1 is presented as the selection of the physical/structural component of the program, the preferred alternative being the construction of four permanent physical barriers, and operation within the existing export constraints of the two water projects (CVP and SWP).

Stage 2 is presented as the selection of a preferred operational component for the program. This selection process will follow the selection of the alternative in Stage 1, and will be subject to a Draft Supplemental EIS/EIR and a full public review. It is at this stage that the relaxation of the existing COE export constraints will be addressed.

The proposed staging approach (see ES-9) does not allow for a complete discussion of key elements such as alternatives to the proposed operation project. Specifically, each of the alternatives evaluated assumes that Stage 2 will include the full diversion of 8500 acre feet. The operation studies included in the Draft EIR/EIS, in a perhaps revealing way, do not include an alternative that conforms to the staged decision process. Operation studies described in this document include:

CSPA-1

No Project	6680	No barriers, dredging, or ag. diversions
Missing Alt.	6680	Full Barriers, dredging and ag. diversion
2A	8500	Full Barriers, dredging, and ag. diversions
2B	8500	Full Barriers, dredging, and ag. diversions
2C	8500	Full Barriers, dredging, and ag. diversions

3B	8500	No Grantline Canal Barrier, dredging, and ag. div.	CSPA-1
4B	8500	No Agricultural Barriers, dredging, and ag. div.	
<p>It is clear that an alternative (the “Missing Alt.” shown above in bold, underlined) which includes the barriers, dredging, and agricultural diversion extensions (physical/structural component), but which is limited to the 6680cfs pumping limitation (no operational component), is missing from the mix. Therefore it will be impossible to separate the effects of Stage 1 from Stage 2 in the analysis.</p>			
<p>The DEIS/R further undermines the effectiveness of the project description through its reliance on the artful use of semantics begins to describe the water transfers. For example, the DEIS/R separates the CVP/SWP contract water deliveries, from the EWA water, the refuge water supplies, and the water transfers for other parties. Thus, the document states that the effects are limited to a 1% to 3% increase in CVP/SWP contract deliveries and for the environmental water (Page ES-5). Yet another 2% increase is then subsequently assigned to water transfers. The Estuary is affected by the whole of the exports, and this “piece-mealing” of the analysis is inappropriate. The analysis should be based on the effects of the 3% to 5% combined increase in exports.</p>			CSPA-2
<p>The narrow definition of the operational component of SDIP to increasing exports in four versions of 8,500 cfs does not allow a thorough discussion of alternative methods of increasing water supply reliability for CVP and SWP export contractors. Despite the DEIS/R’s claim that the alternatives were developed through a “stakeholder process” the range of alternatives is far too narrow and was focused only on increasing exports to 8500 cfs at the SWP pumps in the Delta. This narrow focus was inherent in naming the stakeholder group “the 8500 Stakeholder Process” at DEIS/R Vol. 1a, 2-9.</p>			CSPA-3
<p>In the face of the State Appeals Court ruling on the CalFed EIS/R and ROD we are astounded to find that the document does not consider reductions in exports from the Delta as a means of solving the south Delta problems. The State Appeals Court was quite clear on this issue, and this point alone requires the preparation of a new draft, which includes and analyzes the relevant environmental improvement from choosing such an alternative.</p>			CSPA-4
<p>II. The Long Term CVP/SWP SDIP/OCAP BO is Inadequate</p>			
<p>The SDIP project is based on Endangered Species Act compliance through the CVP/SWP OCAP. A revised BO should be prepared with adequate analyses to determine jeopardy to listed species, including winter and spring run Chinook, steelhead, and Delta smelt. An independent CBDA sponsored review by a team of 6 scientists recently concluded that the SDIP-OCAP BO for salmon had the following deficiencies:</p>			CSPA-5
<p>1. Global climate change was not considered. The BO assumes that the climate and hydrologic regime during the last century will persist into the future. The Panel does not believe that global climate change (e.g.,</p>			

4

temperature warming), and the consequent temperature and hydrological changes, received adequate treatment in the BO. This deficiency resulted in an important uncertainty being ignored that could affect the characterization of the risk to the ESUs.

2. **Variability in ocean productivity, and its affect on fish production, was not incorporated into the analyses.** The current status of the listed populations is, in part, an outcome of recent favorable ocean conditions. What will the status of listed populations be under less favorable conditions that may occur in the near future? By not including variability of ocean conditions in its analysis, the BO does not adequately address whether or not the listed populations are sufficiently large to survive a period of poor ocean conditions.
3. **Unknowns or uncertainty were either not adequately incorporated into the analyses, or their incorporation was not clearly explained.** In some cases, uncertainties were simply ignored or their consideration was deferred to other future analyses or other in-progress biological opinions. For example, Table 9 in the BO (page 193) summarizes the effects of the proposed project on the listed ESUs, but Table 9 fails to list eleven additional effects mentioned in the text of the BO. Ignoring or deferring the consideration of these effects in analyses does not give the listed species the required benefit of the doubt.
4. **Some models and analyses appeared to be flawed.** The application of monthly temperature models to anadromous fish studies is a point of concern. Of particular concern is the adoption, with little discussion, by NMFS of these monthly results both for assessing potential impacts and for setting thermal criteria. In addition, the data used to develop relationships between water temperature and salmon gamete, egg, and alevin mortality was not the best available.
5. **Greater consideration should be given to genetic and spatial diversity in the ESUs.** Too little consideration was given to the genetic and spatial diversity aspects of the ESUs. The Central Valley Technical Recovery Team noted that the “dependent” populations of spring Chinook and steelhead occupy marginally suitable habitats that either depend on migrants from the nearby streams or operate as a meta-population in which each stream is not individually viable, but the group persists. These dependent populations are a valuable resource because they exist in marginal environments, may contain valuable genetic attributes (e.g., higher temperature tolerance), and may serve as links with other populations in ways that increase the viability and resiliency of the ESUs over long time scales. The BO did not adequately treat the genetic and spatial diversity aspects in their analysis.

CSPA-5

The DEIS/R may not rely on an inadequate environmental document to address and mitigate the environmental impacts of the SDIP. *Santa Clara River v. Castaic Lake* (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 1373. Clearly, the BO for the SDIP is inadequate and must be revised and completed prior to release of a new DEIS/R. In order to fully disclose impacts and mitigation measures, the revised BO must be completed prior to release of the new DEIS/R.

CSPA-5

III. The DEIS/R Fails To Consider A Reasonable Range Of Alternatives

“An EIR for any project subject to CEQA must consider a reasonable range of alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which (1) offers substantial environmental advantages over the project’s proposal . . . ; and (2) may be feasibly accomplished in a successful manner considering the economic, environmental, social and technological factors involved.” *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, 566. “The discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.” CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(b).

CSPA-6

The DEIS/R must consider feasible alternatives that would obviate the necessity for increased export capacity. These include: 1) evaluation of the cost effective retirement of marginal farmland (including, but not limited to the selenium-laced soils of Westlands), 2) comprehensive agricultural and urban water conservation (including recycling, reclamation and the capture and treatment of surface/stormwater runoff), and 3) implementation of an aggressive desalination program in Southern California. It is likely that these alternatives would be environmentally superior and considerably more cost effective than the billions of dollars required for the SDIP. The cost of desalination is approaching the \$750 to \$1,000 range. Point and non-point control programs, like TMDLs, are problematic and prohibitively expensive. Conservation is clearly more cost effective than heavily subsidized export water. The DEIS/R should also examine alternatives that would reduce or eliminate the need for dredging (i.e., setback levees). Should the aforementioned alternatives be rejected, the DEIS/R must contain a discussion of why they were considered infeasible.

In October, the California Third District Court of Appeals set aside the CALFED ROD because, among other things, the PEIS for CALFED did not consider an alternative that **reduces** exports from the Delta. In January, the California Supreme Court agreed to review the case. It is therefore shocking to see that similar to the flawed CALFED PEIS, the SDIP DEIS/R does not contain an alternative that reduces Delta exports. This is particularly arbitrary since the first phase of the 8500 cfs project is supposedly only for fish and wildlife purposes and less pumping would seem to be a feasible alternative to meet the purpose and need or objective of the physical barriers project. This is a serious deficiency in the SDIP DEIS/R and must be remedied by development of an alternative that does not require an increase in use of the SWP’s pumping capacity at Clifton Court. The “less export” alternative should be evaluated in light of alternative water supplies for

Delta exporters available and identified in numerous public reports, including DWR Bulletin 160-05.

CSPA-6

The DEIS/R's justification for increased exports south of the Bay-Delta Estuary is predicated upon Bulletin 160-98. However, the recently released California Water Plan Update 2005 demonstrates that, under current trends, south of Delta water demands actually decrease in 2030, even accounting for the increased population. The Water Plan Update provides a reasonable scenario under its Less Resources Intensive assumptions that water use statewide could decrease by up to 500 million acre feet, even without additional water conservation efforts taken by California water agencies. Additionally, a recent report by the Pacific Institute titled *California Water 2030: an Efficient Future* demonstrates that California water use in 2030 could be 20% below 2000 levels, even with a growing population and a healthy economy. Basing water demand upon outdated and discredited information while ignoring more recent relevant information is misleading and unacceptable. The DEIS/R must be withdrawn and reanalyzed using a reduced export alternative.

CSPA supports Trinity County's suggestion for development of a "Land Retirement Alternative" which returns water to the environment and other water users as follows:

A revised SDIP DEIS/R should expand on Appendix A of the Trinity River Fishery Restoration Supplemental EIR (shown below revised as Table 1). Table 1 portrays a rough estimate of the potential water savings associated with the retirement of lands within the San Luis Unit, Delta-Mendota Canal Unit and the San Joaquin River Exchange Contractors of the Central Valley Project that are expected to require drainage service. The purpose of the Trinity County analysis was to estimate an amount of CVP water that could be obtained from the retirement of drainage-impacted lands in the 3 units of the CVP. The water savings would then be dedicated to increase cold-water storage, drought protection, and recreational use in upstream reservoirs. Use of this water should be dedicated to environmental restoration, water quality, or other water users as needed. The total land with drainage problems is 376,751 acres in the water districts identified below in Table 1, but other problem areas also exist outside of the SLU and DMC areas, as identified in Table 2 below.

CSPA-7

The analysis below shows that land retirement could save 793,056 AF in total CVP contracted water, which would have been an actual reduction in demand of 568,373 AF in 2002, the same year as the unprecedented Klamath Fish Kill on the Trinity River, one of the CVP source rivers. Every increasing diversion from the Delta export projects effect water conditions on all Central Valley Rivers and are causing a decline in species numbers and habitat quality. Permanent land retirement and dedication of water to other CVP project purposes would result in significant benefits from reduced pollution from drainage water, reduced CVP project power usage, increased ability to meet various water quality standards, increased water storage, increased M&I water supplies, and more water for environmental needs such as fishery flows and wildlife refuges. Land retirement could also be the basis for an alternative that reduces exports from the Delta, per the Third District Court of Appeals decision on the CALFED PEIR.

Table 1 from the Draft Trinity River Fishery Restoration Supplemental Environmental
Impact Report (Trinity County 2004, as amended 1/24/05 and 2/16/05)

	Acres	Acres Requiring Drainage Service	% of District Requiring Drainage Service	Max CVP Contract Amount (AF)	Max CVP Contract Water Savings (AF)	2002 CVP Contract Deliveries (AF)	2002 CVP Water Savings (AF)
Broadview Water District	9,515	9,515	100.00%	27,000	27,000	18,588	18,588
Panoche Water District	39,292	27,000	68.72%	94,000	64,593	66,743	45,863
Westlands Water District	604,000	298,000	49.34%	1,154,198	569,455	776,631	383,172
Eagle Field	1,438	1,435	99.82%	4,550	4,542	2,869	2,864
Mercy Springs	3,589	2,417	67.35%	2,842	1,914	4,679	3,151
Oro Loma	1,095	1,095	100%	4,600	4,600	3,173	3,173
Widren	881	881	100%	2,990	2,990	2,094	2,094
Firebaugh	23,457	23,457	100%	85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000
Cent. Cal ID Charleston Drainage District (portion of San Luis WD with drainage problems)	149,825	4,951	3.30%	532,400	17,569	532,400	17,569
Pacheco Water District	4,314	3,000	69.54%	8,130	5,654	Not avail	Not avail
Total	842,581	376,751	NA	1,925,790	793,056	1,499,314	568,370

Table 1 above was derived by obtaining acreage information for each district through Chris Eacock at the Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) in Fresno. The number of acres requiring drainage by 2050 was taken from estimates in the San Luis Drainage Feature Evaluation, Plan Formulation Report, USBR, December, 2002 (pages 2-5 and 2-6). The maximum water savings associated with the retirement of these lands was calculated by multiplying the maximum contract amounts for each district by the percent of that district requiring drainage. Contract amounts were taken from a list of CVP contracts provided by Reclamation. Each district's total contract amount was calculated by adding all of its water contracts if more than one contract exists.

According to information we have received from the Environmental Working Group, water and crop subsidies to Westlands in 2002 amounted to over \$100 million. If approximately half of Westlands, as well as those impacted lands in other drainage-problem districts such as Broadview, Widren, Mercy Springs, Panoche, Pacheco and others were retired, it would free up hundreds of thousands of acre-feet of water, as well as significantly reduce water and crop subsidies by tens of millions of dollars a year. Full analysis of such an alternative would provide meaningful disclosure to decision makers and the public about the true costs of delivering water to these problem lands.

Table 2

	Total Irrigated croplands in 2002(acres)	Drainage Impaired acreage in 2000 (acres)	% of County Requiring Drainage Service	Estimated Contract Amounts (AF)	Estimated Water Savings (AF)
Tulare County	652,385	291,000	44.60%	1,304,770	581,927
Kern County	811,672	313,000	38.56%	1,623,344	625,961
Total	1,464,057	604,000	N/A	2,928,114	1,207,888

Table 2 above portrays a very preliminary estimate of water savings in Tulare and Kern County within the SWP service area. The acres of irrigated croplands in these Counties was taken from the USDA farm census statistics report in 2002. The acreage of drainage impaired acres is derived from a report by CA Dept of Water Resources, the 2000 San Joaquin Valley Drainage Monitoring Program. The acreages identified are for lands with high groundwater within 20 feet of the surface. The contract amounts were figured by estimating 2 acre-feet per acre irrigated, most likely an underestimated amount. Further investigation is needed to verify and refine these numbers, but clearly there is adequate justification to remove these lands from irrigation due to continuing drainage problems and salinization of land, in violation of Water Code Section 100- Wasteful and Unreasonable Use of Water.

Finally, the DEIS/R not only fails to suggest reasonable alternatives to the barriers project that would better solve the objectives of a real South Delta Improvement program-land retirement and less export, it also fails to evaluate the impacts of increasing the capacity to deliver export water to drainage impacted land.

CSPA-8

IV. The Selection of Alternatives Biases the Analysis, Predetermines Results and Fails to Achieve Identified Purposes of the Project.

The DEIS/R unreasonably narrows the project purposes to eliminate reasonable alternatives. The identified purposes of the project are defined as:

CSPA-9

1. Reduce the movement of San Joaquin River watershed Central Valley fall/late fall-run juvenile Chinook salmon into the south Delta via Old River.
2. Maintain adequate water levels and, through improved circulation, water quality available for agricultural diversions in the south Delta, downstream of the head of Old River; and
3. Increase water delivery reliability for SWP and CVP water contractors south of the Delta and provide opportunities to convey water for fish and wildlife purposes by increasing the maximum permitted level of diversion through the existing gates at CCF to 8,500 cfs.

CSPA-9

However, other than the no-project alternative, the only alternatives considered are construction of permanent barriers and increasing exports. This disingenuously predetermines the outcome and inappropriately excludes feasible less environmentally damaging alternatives. Arbitrarily excluding less environmentally damaging alternatives fails to meet the required scope of CEQA and NEPA.

In any case, project implementation will not meet the purposes of the project.

1. Construction of a Head-of-Old-River barrier may enable out-migrating salmonids to continue down the San Joaquin River rather than being drawn down Old River. However, DWR's particle tracking model and Vogel's radio-telemetry studies establish that San Joaquin out-migrants will subsequently be drawn down Turner and Columbia Cuts to the state and federal project pumps. Out-migrant salmonids still will not reach Chipps' Island.² Reducing the movement of salmonids into the south Delta via Old River accomplishes no environmental purpose if they escape Old River only to be drawn to the pumps via Turner and Columbia Cuts.
2. Likewise, project implementation will not improve water levels and water quality in the south Delta. As we discuss below, the DEIS/R acknowledges that water levels will decrease in the south Delta and any perceived improvement in water quality is speculative and lost in the noise of the modeling.

CSPA-10

CSPA-11

² http://calwater.ca.gov/Programs/Conveyance/ETDDCCTDE/Sept15_2005/TDF_Presentation_Vogel_9-15-05.pdf; http://science.calwater.ca.gov/pdf/2002_Salmonid_Workshop_Summary.pdf (page 37); Vogel D. 2001. Juvenile Chinook salmon radio-telemetry study in the northern Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, January – February 2000. Final project report submitted to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Stockton, Calif. Red Bluff (CA); Natural Resources Sciences, Inc. 32 p; and Vogel D. 2002. Juvenile Chinook salmon radio-telemetry study in the southern Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, December 2000 – January 2001. Final report submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Stockton, Calif. Red Bluff (CA); Natural Resources Sciences, Inc. 27 p.

3. The only project purpose that is potentially realized by project implementation is increased water exports. However, increasing exports is not likely to improve water supply reliability as DWR's Draft 2005 Reliability Report predicts that as water deliveries increase, reliability actually decreases. While the Reliability Report contains serious flaws that must be corrected, DWR has elected to use the report analysis as the method for determining project water supply reliability. The Reliability Report shows that the SWP is estimated to be capable of delivering 1.2 maf about 90% of the time under DWR's 2025 modeling while deliveries of around 3 maf are only reliable in less than 70% of years. The DEIS/R must analyze how increasing exports under the proposed alternatives affects the reliability curve of the SWP.

CSPA-12

V. The DEIS/R Fails To Provide An Adequate Discussion of the Project Setting and Therefore Fails to Properly Analyze SDIP impacts to Fisheries

"Accurate and complete information pertaining to the setting of the project and surrounding uses" is critical to an evaluation of a project's impact on the environment. *San Joaquin Raptor/Wildlife Center v. Stanislaus County* (1994)27 Cal. App. 4th 713, 729; *See also Friends of the Eel River v. Sonoma County Water Agency* (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 859, 875 ("incomplete description of the Project's environmental setting fails to set the stage for a discussion of" significant effects). As detailed below, the DEIS/R does not provide a complete analysis of the current state of the Delta and therefore cannot adequately address the impacts of the SDIP on the environment.

Abundance indices calculated by the Interagency Ecological Program (IEP) suggest recent marked declines in numerous pelagic fishes and zooplankton in the upper San Francisco Estuary (the Delta and Suisun Bay). These low levels were unexpected given the relatively moderate hydrology over the past three years. IEP proposes to augment existing monitoring, perform new data analyses, and conduct special studies to investigate whether there is a new threat to pelagic fish and their prey, and if so, what has caused it.

CSPA-13

The IEP conceptual model includes at least three general factors that may be acting individually or in concert to lower pelagic productivity: 1) toxins; 2) invasive species; and 3) water project operations. The overall approach adopted in 2005 is a screening-level study to better define the degree to which each of these factors may be responsible individually, in sequence, or in concert for the apparent step-changes. The workplan is based on a "triage" model to identify the most likely causes, and to assign priorities to projects on the basis of where funds and resources can be best used. Results also may shed additional light on causes of long-term declines in several of the affected species. Several of the lines of inquiry will be managed on an adaptive basis in that information will be examined as it is made available and depending on the results, increasingly focused studies will be conducted in 2006 and later years. SDIP needs to wait for the results of those studies before effective mitigations can be designed and implemented.

CSPA-13

As noted, the abundance indices calculated by the IEP Fall Mid-water Trawl survey (MWT) show marked declines in numerous pelagic fishes in the upper San Francisco Estuary (the Delta and Suisun Bay). The abundance indices for 2002-2004 include record lows for delta smelt and age-0 striped bass and near record lows for longfin smelt and threadfin shad (Bryant and Souza 2004; Hieb et al. 2005). Data from another IEP monitoring survey, the Summer Tow Net Survey (TNS), support the MWT findings: TNS abundance indices for striped bass and delta smelt were among the lowest indices in the 45-yr record. In contrast, the San Francisco Bay Study did not show significant declines in its catches of marine/lower estuary species (Hieb et al. 2004; Hieb et al. 2005). Based on these findings, the problem appears to be limited to fish dependent on the upper estuary.

In addition to the declines in fish species, IEP monitoring also found declining abundance trends for zooplankton with a substantial drop in calanoid copepod abundance in 2004. Calanoid copepods such as *Eurytemora affinis* and *Pseudodiaptomus forbesi* are the primary food for larval pelagic fishes in the upper estuary (IEP 1987; Meng and Orsi 1991; Nobriga 2002) as well as older life stages of planktivorous species such as delta smelt (Lott 1998). Conversely, the invasive cyclopoid copepod *Limnithona tetraspina*, which may be a poor food source for fish and an intraguild predator of calanoid copepods, is increasing in abundance and continues to be the most abundant copepod in the estuary (Mecum 2005).

While several of these declining species - including longfin smelt, juvenile striped bass and calanoid copepods have shown evidence of a long-term decline - there appears to have been a precipitous "step-change" to very low abundance during 2002-2004. This observation is supported by initial statistical analyses of the MWT data (Manley in prep.). Moreover, the record or near-record low abundance levels are remarkable in that the hydrological regime in the San Francisco Estuary was moderate during this period. Many estuarine organisms including longfin smelt and striped bass typically produce poor year classes in dry years (Jassby et al. 1995); delta smelt abundance is generally lowest in very wet or very dry years (Moyle et al. 1992). Thus, the moderate hydrology during the past three years should have supported at least modest production.

The fact that multiple pelagic species at more than one trophic level seem to show the 2002-2004 step decline is of particular concern. Regardless of whether the observations over the past three years are remarkable, the fact that the efforts of the California Bay-Delta Authority (CBDA) have apparently not arrested long-term declines in some pelagic species indicates that additional efforts are needed to identify what limits pelagic fisheries production in the upper estuary. Over the past decade, CBDA activities have resulted in a major shift in the timing of water exports, the development of an Environmental Water Account, and construction of habitat restoration projects. Additional information about the factors affecting pelagic organisms is needed before alternatives are designed for the SDIP, and provide guidance for future activities in the upper estuary including step 2 of SDIP.

Kimmerer (2002a) showed that water project operations have resulted in lower winter/spring inflow and higher summer inflow to the Delta. As noted previously, the CBDA actions have restored some spring inflow, but have also increased summer inflows to meet increasing summer export demands. This shift was implemented based on the assumption that it would be more protective to sensitive early life stages of key estuarine fishes and invertebrates. However, it is possible that high export during summer-winter months has unanticipated food web effects by exporting biomass that would otherwise support the estuarine food web. Other possible mechanisms include increased entrainment of fishes during the summer-winter months, or a reduction in habitat quality downstream (e.g. less area of the appropriate salinity). Total annual exports have continued to increase under the CBDA. It is also possible that the total volume diverted on an annual basis influences estuarine productivity (Livingston et al. 1997, Jassby et al 2002). The FEIR/S must disclose such information, analyze potential impacts from increased usage of pumping capacity in light of the uncertainties inherent in installation of permanent barriers and making operational changes to include further use of 8500 cfs export capacity.

CSPA-14

We also suggest that you further evaluate impacts of SDIP in light of knowledge that in the past few years, more water has been exported during the summer (July-September) and the winter (December-March) than before, in part to compensate for conservation-driven export reductions in spring (April and May). There have been other changes in water project operation changes, which may also have had unexpected biological side-effects (e.g. export of more primary production). The purpose of ongoing scientific investigation is to closely examine recent changes in water project operations to identify effects potentially strong enough to account for the apparent step change in pelagic fish species abundances since 2001.

Other historical changes in water project operations should also be disclosed and analyzed to support the decision-makers understanding of historical population dynamics for fish species in the Bay/Delta and to advance knowledge of the role of water project operations in the long-term decline of certain pelagic fish species. "Dramatic increases in winter CVP and SWP salvage occurred contemporaneously with recent declines in several pelagic fish species. These unexpected increases in salvage density coincide with the step decline pelagic fishes in 2002. The *Winter Adult Entrainment Hypothesis* presently being studied by the CALFED program posits that these events are causally linked. Evidence for this hypothesis includes:

CSPA-15

1. There appears to have been a step increase in salvage density of adult delta smelt, threadfin shad and longfin smelt between 2001 and 2002. This increase is consistent with recent-year changes in winter water export operations. See Herbold et al
2. There appears to have been a step decrease in the Fall Mid-water Trawl indices of adult delta smelt, threadfin shad, and longfin smelt between 2001 and 2002. See Study Component 2i report by Manly and Chotkowski for details.

3. Winter exports from the CVP and SWP have increased since the late 1990s. See Study Component 2h report by Simi and Ruhl for details.

Increased winter entrainment of delta smelt, long-fin smelt and threadfin shad represents a loss of the pre-spawning adults and all potential progeny. This means on a per capita basis loss of each adult fish may be equivalent to the loss of hundreds or even thousands of juveniles later in the year. Because an entrainment impact specifically affecting adult fishes has the potential to be strong, we regard finding an explanation for this coincidence a high priority.

CSPA-15

The main sorts of explanations for why winter salvage densities may have increased since 2002 include: (1) the source of exported water has been changed to an area where more of these fishes occur during the winter; (2) the affected fishes have moved to areas from which exports are drawn; and/or 3) winter exports have increased past some sort of hydrodynamic threshold below which fish were better able to avoid entrainment. We expect well-documented answers in the FEIS/R to questions like: How have recent (1995 – 2004) water project operations policy changes changed delta hydrology? "Hydrology" is meant here to include the volume, timing, and pattern of input flows into the delta, delta outflow, exports, and operation of various water project gates and barriers. We also ask: which, if any, of the changes might plausibly have contributed to, or caused, a step change decrease in pelagic fishes abundance since 2001? We also want to know how the barriers will effect the questions above.

We suggest that you redo the DEIR/S to adopt the following assumptions for your new analysis since the on-going IEP study is using them:

CSPA-16

1. Stressor effects on pelagic populations are highest during the summer period.
2. Ideal" hydrology in 2005 will not result in substantial increases in the abundance of pelagic fish and calanoid copepods.
3. Stressor effects have increased during the summer period relative to historical data.

We further suggest that you redo the inadequate analysis in the DEIS/R of the potential for the SDIP to aggravate the unfolding pelagic fish crash. A thorough analysis of the direct and indirect effects of building the barriers on reverse flows, water levels, entrainment of salmon and smelt, predation, residence time of water in the South Delta, and hydrodynamic changes in the South Delta caused by the new permanent barriers should be prepared. The analysis that presently exists in the DEIS/R is not adequate to justify selection of any of the alternatives presented and will result in misleading the decision-makers about the environmental impacts of the project and what course to take in their respective decision documents.

CSPA-17

VI. The DEIS/R Fails to Adequately Analyze Project Impacts.

An EIR must provide information about the magnitude and type of environmental impacts; it may not, as this draft does, simply speculate that there may be impacts and hope for the best. See *Stanislaus Natural Heritage Project v. County of Stanislaus* (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 182, 196-97. An EIR must also provide “information about how adverse the adverse impact will be.” *Santiago County Water District v. County of Orange* (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 818, 831. This information must contain facts and analysis, not the agency’s bare conclusions”) See *Citizens of Goleta Valley*, 52 Cal. 3d at 568.

As detailed below, the DEIS/R fails to provide an adequate analysis of a range of project impacts. This failure renders the DEIS/R inadequate and requires that the DEIS/R be revised and recirculated prior to project approval.

1. Water Quality Impacts from SDIP were inadequately disclosed and considered in the DEIS/R.

The analysis of water quality impacts in the DEIS/R is woefully inadequate. The SDIP must be consistent with and comply with requirements of the federal Water Pollution Control Act and California’s Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Delta water quality must not be sacrificed at the altar of increased exports. The historical export of South Delta water has fundamentally altered the movement of pollutants throughout the Delta. Rapid population growth in the South Delta is increasing the mass loading of numerous pollutants (i.e., wastewater, stormwater, illegal dumping). Implementation of the SDIP will further alter the distribution and concentration of these constituents. The majority of water quality monitoring has primarily focused on salinity, with little emphasis on other water quality parameters. Sufficient baseline field data does not yet exist to adequately calibrate/verify models and evaluate project effects on the rainbow of water quality constituents (i.e., virtually the entire suite of organic and inorganic pollutants) that will likely be affected by the project. A rigorous water quality analysis should precede project evaluation, alternative formulation, and implementation.

CSPA-18

As previously noted, attached and included as a part of these comments is the assessment titled *Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement Environmental Impact Report, South Delta Improvement Program* by Dr. G. Fred Lee and Dr. Anne Jones-Lee on the fundamental inadequacy of the DEIS/R’s analysis of the project’s potential adverse impacts to water quality. (Attachment 1)

The DEIS/R failed to address our scoping comments for this project with respect to water quality issues. It does, however, acknowledge that the project will require a Clean Water Act § 401 Certification. Regardless of whether our concerns are adequately addressed in this environmental review, DWR and BOR cannot avoid addressing these issues in what is likely to be a highly contested certification process.

CSPA-19

The Delta is identified on the California Clean Water Act 303(d) List as impaired because of diazinon, chlorpyrifos, DDT, Group A Pesticides, electrical conductivity, mercury, organic enrichment/low dissolved oxygen and unknown toxicity. Old and Middle Rivers

CSPA-20

are listed as impaired because of low dissolved oxygen. The DEIS/R acknowledges that changes in hydrology can affect fate and transport of pollutants. It also acknowledges that synthetic and natural contaminants have bioaccumulated in Delta fish and other aquatic organisms and that synthetic organic chemicals and heavy metals are found in Delta fish in quantities exceeding acceptable standards for food consumption. Inexplicably, the DEIS/R fails to address the project's effects on the full suite of pollutants presently identified as impairing Delta waters, with the exception of salt. The DEIS/R cannot simply evaluate project impacts in terms of a "conservative" constituent like salt or impacts to dissolved oxygen in the Stockton deep-water channel. It must analyze and quantify the Project's effects on toxicity and impairing constituents in the south Delta and propose mitigation, so that the public and decision makers may reach their own conclusions about the adverse impacts of the project. *Save Our Peninsula v. County of Monterey* (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 99, 130. See *Citizens to Preserve the Ojai v. County of Ventura* (1986) 176 Cal. App. 3d 421, 432-33 (finding "an absolute failure to comply [with CEQA]" where information relevant to project's impacts was omitted).

CSPA-20

Toxicity to lower tropic populations in Paradise Cut, attributable to organophosphorus insecticides, extends for weeks at a time. Delta waters frequently contain a cocktail of as many as 15 pesticides. Many of these interact additively or synergistically and/or bind to sediment. The tissue of fish collected from the South Delta contains high concentrations of bioaccumulative toxins (i.e., legacy pesticides, mercury and PCBs). Changes in south Delta hydrology will inevitably affect the fate and transport of these toxic constituents. The DEIS/R must be revised to include a characterization and assessment of the sources, mass loading and fate and transport of all pollutants likely to be present in south Delta channels and an evaluation of water quality impacts from the project and alternatives.

There are indications that selenium loads in the San Joaquin River have historically been diverted down Old River. Benthic organisms bio-accumulate selenium. The EIR/EIS should evaluate the effects of redirected selenium loads into the eutrophic areas of the Central Delta.

Dioxin concentrations significantly above levels protective of public health have been documented throughout San Francisco Bay and the Stockton Deep-Water Channel. Discussion with staff from the California Department of Public Health and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, as well as private consultants, lead CSPA to believe that elevated concentrations of dioxins are likely present in the South Delta. The SDIP should evaluate the project's effects on likely dioxin concentrations in the South Delta.

Elevated levels of pathogens have been identified in the South Delta. Changes in flow will likely have an effect on concentration and spatial distribution of bacteria, viruses and parasites. Consequently, the DEIS/R must identify and evaluate the project's effects on pathogens.

The project's permanent barriers and inevitable changes in hydrology and export rates will likely have a significant effect on existing efforts to achieve water quality standards.

CSPA-21

<p>The DEIS/R must discuss the project's compatibility with TMDLs, Toxic Hot Spot Cleanup Plans, NPDES permitting for increased contaminate loading and Basin Water Quality Control Plans. It must also discuss how altered flow and increased exports will effect implementation of control measures.</p>	CSPA-21
<p>Increased exports will likely alter streamflow regimes on major tributaries to the Delta (including the Trinity and Klamath Rivers). The DEIS/R must more completely evaluate and discuss the project's effects on the physical and chemical parameters necessary to support renewable fisheries within upstream tributaries and reservoirs.</p>	CSPA-22
<p>Increased exports during certain periods of the year will likely lead to reductions in streamflow during other times of the year (as the VAMP did on the San Joaquin River). This will almost certainly lead to a reduction in assimilative capacity (i.e., reduction in available dilution) on a number of Bay/Delta tributary rivers during certain time-periods. Reduction in streamflow and the resulting loss of assimilative capacity could necessitate more stringent NPDES permit limits. More restrictive permit limits will require dischargers to expend enormous sums of money to comply with new limits. The DEIS/R must evaluate the impacts to dischargers who will face more stringent permit limits caused by reductions in available dilution.</p>	CSPA-23
<p>A significant SDIP component involves increased dredging of south Delta channels. Recently, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board strengthened requirements for dredging and dredge spoil placement. A comprehensive assessment of contaminate remobilization from dredging activities and potential effects of land disposal on terrestrial organisms is required. The discussion must include an evaluation of the adequacy of available sediment analyses (i.e., number of core samples, locations, constituents analyzed, concentrations, detection limits, etc.) and identify and evaluate disposal sites.</p>	CSPA-24
<p>Lastly, we note that State Water Resource Control Board Revised Water Rights Decision 1641 changes the salinity standard for south Delta channels from 0.7 mmhos/cm (April through August) to 1.0 mmhos/cm upon implementation of the permanent barriers. This degradation of water quality represents a significant adverse environmental impact. The DEIS/R is deficient for not discussing and mitigating this degradation of water quality on south Delta agriculture.</p>	CSPA-25
<p>2. The Analysis of Upstream Fisheries Impacts Caused by SDIP Is Inadequate.</p>	
<p>The SDIP DEIS/EIR contains unsubstantiated findings about the lack of impacts to Central Valley fisheries. Spring chinook, fall Chinook and steelhead spawn, migrate and hold during periods when temperatures can be an issue in the summer and early fall. The same is true for pelagic species in the Delta. The DEIS/R fails to recognize the importance of steelhead and Chinook in sport, tribal and commercial harvest, and it fails to identify that lower upstream carryover storage will have a negative impact on the survival of Central Valley fisheries below major dams. The DEIS/R completely ignores</p>	CSPA-26

the issue of cold water reserves that are required in upstream reservoirs to ensure that adequate stream temperatures can be achieved in the dry periods and parts of each year (summer) in which cold water is most necessary for species survival.

CSPA-26

Presumably, increased export rates could lead to drawdown of upstream reservoirs. Should the SDIP lead to reductions in upstream reservoir storage and water elevation, the effects on fisheries and recreation in the affected impoundments requires a much more complete analysis than has been done in the DEIS/R. It should also discuss potential effects to non-state water project facilities and water rights holders (i.e., those having to meet shortfalls induced by the SDIP).

The DEIS/R should be revised to include a full analysis of impacts to Central Valley River temperatures from the SDIP-OCAP project and of each alternative's likely consistency with State and federal water quality standards and objectives. The DEIS/R revision should evaluate project compliance with all Delta water quality standards, including the .7 EC standard at interior Delta locations as required by D-1641.

CSPA-27

CSPA-28

The BOR has previously recognized the need to lower Delta export as a result of a decision limiting diversions from the Trinity to the Sacramento/Delta system. The 2000 Trinity River Record of Decision (ROD) called for increased fishery flows into the Trinity River from Trinity and Lewiston Dams, corresponding to roughly a 1/1 reduction in water exports to the Sacramento River. It is now apparent that the BOR, through the SDIP, has no intention whatsoever of honoring its requirement to reduce water exports to the CVP commensurate with the increase in Trinity River fishery flows. Instead, BOR intends to continue historic deliveries of CVP water from the Delta, as indicated by the numerous CVP long-term contracts such as the San Luis Unit that promise larger future deliveries.

CSPA-29

Therefore, approval of the SDIP and implementation of the Joint Point of Diversion whereby the CVP can send its "surplus" water south of the Delta using SWP pumping capacity will surely result in depleted cold water reserves in all upstream Reservoirs at the beginning of the next multi-year drought. The DEIS/R should identify the source of water for increased SDIP exports and disclose and evaluate environmental impacts in the source areas. Whose water are they exporting in this project anyway?

CSPA-30

3. The DEIS/R Fails to Acknowledge, Address and Mitigate Project Impacts to the Tracy Fish Facility.

The DEIS/R ignores the effects of barrier operation in conjunction with accelerated export pumping on Central Valley Project export facilities. While DWR's pumping facility draws water from Clifton Court Forebay, the BOR relies upon the Old River tidal pool for its water supply. Implementation of the temporary barriers and increased export pumping have caused water stage height in Old River to decline causing head loss at the BOR pumps, especially during low tides. The Tracy Fish Facility is no longer able to operate within design criteria in accordance with the Biological Opinion and export pumping costs have increased. Moving the Grantline Canal barrier further downstream

CSPA-31

will further constrict BOR's tidal pool. The proposed project will exacerbate these problems by causing further and longer reductions in stage height, reduced fish salvage effectiveness, greater turbulence and increased electricity costs.

The south Delta has lost 4-5 feet in stage height since the 1950's. BOR staff has suggested that as much as an additional 4 feet head loss could occur in the coming years from implementation of the Intertie (1.5 foot loss), Banks 8,500 cfs (1 foot loss) and Banks 10,200 (1.5 foot loss).

CSPA-31

Temporary barriers and increased pumping have reduced primary and secondary channel and holding tank velocities and secondary bypass ratios are now below one. Turbulence has increased. The primary channel was designed to operate at a 16-21 foot depth but now operates at 13-19 foot depth. The secondary channel was designed to operate at a 5-10 foot depth but presently operates at a 0.5-8 foot depth. The holding tank was designed to operate at a minimum depth of 5 feet but now operates at a minimum depth of 0.5 feet. Fish salvage effectiveness has been reduced from design criteria (80-90% in the 1960's) to 50-60% (early 1990's) to less than 20% today. Improving TFCF Hydraulics, Lloyd Hess, Attachment 2.

BOR project pumps are 3 feet lower than DWR's export pumps. Operation of permanent barriers will:

- a. Reduce the volume of water available to BOR at low tides.
- b. Will cause longer low tides.
- c. Increase debris buildup on trash racks.
- d. Increase power costs from having to raise water from a lower elevation.
- e. Further decrease the efficiency of salvage operations.
- f. Increase sedimentation in Old River adjacent to BOR's facility.

The DEIS/R must be withdrawn and revised to analyze and discuss the project's adverse impacts to the BOR facility.

4. The DEIS/R Fails to Adequately Analyze and Mitigate Impacts from New and/or Modified Irrigation Diversions.

Since the project will lower water levels in the south Delta during periods of high export pumping, the project proposes to extend 24 agricultural intakes and install more powerful pumps to facilitate irrigation. These new pumps will replace less powerful pumps or, in many cases, existing siphons and are more likely to entrain fish. However, these new pump intakes will not be screened in violation of California Department of Fish and Game and NOAA Fisheries fish screen policies. This despite clear evidence from DWR's Particle Tracking Model that these diversions are a cause for fish loss in the south Delta. The DEIS/R is deficient for not analyzing and mitigating increased entrainment.

CSPA-32

5. The DEIS/R's Analysis and Explanation of the Project's Effects on South Delta Water Circulation and Water Quality is Deficient.

One of the three identified project purposes is to "[m]aintain adequate water levels and, through increased circulation, water quality available for agricultural diversions in the south Delta, downstream of the head of Old River." The DEIS/R describes the modified circulation pattern as:

- a. During high tides the three gates will be lowered to allow water to flow upstream. The gates will be raised prior to the following ebb tides to ensure adequate water level remains behind the gates.
- b. The height of the Grantline Canal barrier will be lower than the Old River and Middle River barriers and this will ensure that water will flow from Old and Middle River into Grantline Canal to exit over the Grantline barrier.

CSPA-33

The Summary of Environmental Effect (Chapter 4, page 4.4) states that construction and operation of permanent gates would not result in any significant reductions in south Delta channel tidal level. This begs the question of what is significant. For example, Figure 4.1 (Minimum and Maximum Tidal Level for Grant Line Canal at Tracy Boulevard Bridge for Each Alternative) reveals that installation of permanent barriers would reduce the tidal level about 0.5 feet (maximum tide) and up to 1.0 feet (minimum tide). Examination of DSM-2 validation (Appendix D-24 – D-26) reveals that model simulations of tidal elevations in south Delta waterways are 0.5 foot to 1.0 foot higher than measured tidal elevations. Clearly, replacement of the temporary barriers with permanent barriers results in lower water elevation in the south Delta.

The DEIS/R doesn't include DSM-2 validation for salinity (EC) for interior south Delta stations. However, DWR's web sit does contain comparisons between current calibration and observed EC levels for interior south Delta stations. <http://modeling.water.ca.gov/delta/studies/validation2000/map.html>. Both 14-Day Moving Averages and 24.75 Hour Running Averages show substantial differences between simulated and observed EC levels. For example, simulated EC at Old River at Tracy Boulevard is often more than 1,000 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ lower than field observation. Any representation regarding improved EC in the south Delta resulting from implementation of permanent barriers must be taken with a grain of salt. The DEIS/R must be revised to adequately discuss the potential errors in modeling and the relative probabilities of increased circulation, water levels and water quality.

CSPA-34

The modeling fails to account for resistance in the upper reaches of Old and Middle Rivers, especially during the two low tide cycles each month. As tidal flow pushes upstream, it encounters greater resistance until the net flow disappears and a null zone develops. Resistance can also be increased as channel geometry changes (i.e., increases in sedimentation or formation of sandbars). DWR modeling relies upon old data and, consequently, it is unlikely that the simulations accurately reflect current conditions. It also incorporates an assumed average salinity concentration for local agricultural

CSPA-35

discharges despite the fact that central Delta farmers discharge lower levels of salt than south Delta farmers. This has the effect of understating the salinity in return flows and the resulting salinity concentrations in south Delta channels. Further DSM-2 treats waterways as boxes and a comparison of actual channel dimensions with modeled dimensions reveals substantial differences, often as much as 20-25% (personal conversation, Jeff Stuart, NOAA Fisheries). These effects are likely to be exacerbated as agricultural diversions remove water from the channels. It is possible that, under these conditions, there would be no net flow down Grantline Canal. Indeed, considering that the modeling of agricultural diversion is based upon 30-day averages (and farmers don't irrigate on 30-day averages), it is likely that actual agricultural diversions would lead to channel depletion causing reverse flows down Old and Middle Rivers for significant periods. The DEIS/R must be revised to provide a candid in-depth discussion of how circulation will be assured under the project.

CSPA-35

There have been several suggestions that the use of low lift pumps would help ameliorate problems caused by lack of circulation. We note that Volume 1, Page 2-23, Gate Design and Construction Detail states that "[p]er a developing agreement with south Delta water users, three agricultural gates may include structural and wiring features that would allow the easy addition of low head pumps and piping, should this contingency prove necessary and appropriate in the future." However, this would raise problems of its own and is clearly outside the scope of the described project. As such, implementation of these structural and wiring features would represent an illegal commitment of resources in violation of CEQA.

CSPA-36

Another problem largely ignored in the DEIS/R is that reductions in San Joaquin River flow through the HOR barrier will make it more problematic for farmers along Tom Paine Slough, Paradise Cut and below the HOR barrier to irrigate. Even a brief loss of suction to a siphon would represent significant trouble and cost to a farmer. The description of potential impacts to Tom Paine Slough, Paradise Cut and upper Old River is seriously deficient and must be revised.

CSPA-37

Nor does the DEIS/R adequately discuss the quality of agricultural discharges and return flows and discharges of stormwater and wastewater from municipalities. Considering the rapid growth and increased pollutant loading from Tracy, Mountain House and adjacent communities, it is likely that water quality problems will be exacerbated during periods of low flow or stagnation. The DEIS/R must analyze the effects of these pollutant inputs on water quality.

CSPA-38

6. The DEIS/R Ignores Impacts to Aquatic Life from Construction and Operation of Permanent Barriers.

Although DFG trawls are no longer conducted in south Delta channels, these waterways once provided good habitat for Delta smelt. Oddly, there is no analysis of the impacts to aquatic life, including Delta smelt, in south Delta channels although the construction and operation of the permanent barriers and other structural components are likely to have

CSPA-39

adverse impacts. The DEIS/R must be revised to include a rigorous discussion of potential impacts to all life stages of all aquatic life in these waterways.

CSPA-39

7. The DEIS/R Fails to Analyze the Impacts of Increased Winter Pumping on Delta Smelt.

As previously noted, the decline of pelagic species in the Delta has occurred during periods of increased export pumping and operation of the EWC. In fact, IEP studies have suggested that increased winter pumping is a contributing factor to recent declines of Delta smelt. Since the DEIR/S relies upon EWC, it must analyze and mitigate for adverse impacts to Delta smelt and other species caused by increase EWC winter pumping.

CSPA-40

8. The DEIS/R Fails to Analyze Redirected Impacts from SDIP.

The scoping document for the SDIP identified the primary issues as: 1) current and proposed diversion rates impede the ability to divert irrigation water, 2) salinity standards, and 3) decline in Delta smelt and San Joaquin River salmon populations. The project's elements are defined as: 1) increased maximum export capacity at Clifton Court Forebay, 2) dredging in Old River to facilitate increased exports, 3) improved agricultural water delivery by construction of permanent operable barriers and local channel dredging, and 4) construction of a fish control structure at the head of Old River to reduce salmon losses at CVP and SWP export facilities.

However, increased export rates, the potential for increases in total export quantity and the inevitable altered hydrographs on numerous tributaries are likely to affect the entire Central Valley circulatory system. Many of the Delta's present problems derive from a failure to consider the redirected or system-wide impacts caused by previous projects. The DEIS/R must reevaluate the project's potential present and future redirected adverse impacts on: 1) the suite of water quality problems and pollutants in the Delta, downstream waters (Suisun and San Francisco Bays) and upstream tributaries (including the Trinity-Klamath system), 2) aquatic life populations in those waterbodies and 3) existing programs to meet water quality standards (i.e., TMDLs, Toxic Hot Spot cleanup programs, NPDES permits, etc.).

CSPA-41

VII. The DEIS/R Fails to Adequately Analyze Cumulative Impacts Caused by the SDIP and Other On-going State and Federal Programs.

NEPA does not allow projects to be analyzed in artificial isolation. Instead, it requires discussion, in an EA or EIS, of the cumulative impacts of the proposed project in combination with "past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions." 40 C.F.R. § 1508.7; see *Native Ecosystems Council v. Dombeck*, 304 F.3d 886, 895-96 (9th Cir. 2002). That discussion cannot be "perfunctory," *Kern v. United States BLM*, 284 F.3d 1062, 1075 (9th Cir. 2002), but instead must provide "some quantified or detailed information; ... general statements about 'possible' effects and 'some risk' do not constitute a 'hard look' absent a justification regarding why more definitive information

CSPA-42

could not be provided.” *Id.* (quoting *Neighbors of Cuddy Mt. v. United States Forest Serv.*, 137 F.3d 1372, 1379-80 (9th Cir. 1998)). See also *Muckleshoot Indian Tribe v. United States Forest Serv.*, 177 F.3d 800, 811-12 (9th Cir. 1999); *City of Carmel-by-the-Sea v. United States DOT*, 123 F.3d 1142, 1161 (9th Cir.1997); *LaFlamme v. FERC*, 852 F.2d 389, 401-02 (9th Cir. 1988). CEQA similarly requires lead agencies to consider cumulative impacts, or the incremental effects of the proposed project viewed together with the effects of past, current, and probable future projects. Pub. Resources Code § 21083(b); CEQA Guidelines § 15130(a)-(b).

CSPA-42

A cumulative impacts analysis must address “reasonably foreseeable” projects that may have a “synergistic environmental effect” combined with the project under review. *Tenakee Springs*, 915 F.2d at 1312-13. A project is “reasonably foreseeable” when formally proposed by government agencies. *Kern*, 284 F.3d at 1075-78; *Muckleshoot Indian Tribe*, 177 F.3d at 811-12. The state and federal government are required to evaluate their SDIP project in context of the numerous other projects presently contemplated during the thirty-year CalFed program.

Such analysis was particularly necessary here, for the SDIP is a component of a larger set of interrelated actions in the CALFED program, many of which involve sustaining damaging level of exports or increasing extraction of water from the Bay-Delta. In their CALFED programmatic FEIS/EIR, the Bureau and DWR described the SDIP project as part of a broader effort to increase water supply, and the CALFED agencies “recognized that many of their proposed actions were interrelated.” BOR EA/IS for the Interior, at 3-86. Likewise, in the OCAP ESA consultation process, the Bureau, FWS, and NMFS defined the SDIP, along with several other changes to CVP and SWP operations, as part of the same overall OCAP project. Cumulative impacts discussions cannot merely provide “general statements about possible effects.” *Kern*, 284 F.3d at 1075; see *Neighbors of Cuddy Mt.*, 137 F.3d at 1379-80. Yet the SDIP DEIS/R cumulative impacts discussion contains only generalities and unsupported conclusions in violation of both CEQA and NEPA.

Even if it had prepared the cumulative impacts analysis NEPA requires, the Bureau and DWR could not have explained their deviation from the earlier CALFED EIS/EIR’s conclusions, for those conclusions were right. As the CALFED EIS/EIR explained, the SDIP and related projects also designed to sustain or increase exports have significant potential impacts:

CSPA-43

1. Export pumping causes “negative” flows, in which water flows toward the south Delta pumps rather than San Francisco Bay, for many months each year. Those “[r]everse flows...have contributed to the reduction of Bay-Delta productivity and of some Bay-Delta invertebrate and fish populations.” *Id.* at 6.1-8, 6.1-42 (listing affected species, many of which are threatened or endangered);

2. Export pumping pulls saline water into the Delta. "Sea-water intrusion into the Delta can be intensified by diversion of fresh water and the corresponding decrease of freshwater outflow from the Delta" *Id.* at 5.2-5;
3. Export pumping causes "salinity [that] adversely affects most beneficial uses. Bromides associated with sea water lead to the formation of DBPs in treated water." *Id.* at 5.3-11. Salinity intrusion also forces open water species that prefer non-saline habitat to move from Suisun Bay, which provides open-water habitat, into the Delta, which does not. *Id.*; *see id.* at 6.1-35 (explaining benefits of minimizing saline intrusion);
4. Export pumping kills thousands of fish. Those fish die through "direct loss at pumps, reduced survival when young fish are drawn out of river channels into the Delta, and reduced spawning success of adults when migratory cues are altered." Therefore, "most species are potentially affected" by pumping increases, "including chinook salmon, delta smelt, steelhead, and striped bass"—all of which are protected under federal law;
5. Export pumping for irrigating the west side of the San Joaquin Valley, where SDIP water will be transported, drains pollutants into the San Joaquin River and the Bay-Delta. *Id.* at 5.3-7. The CALFED Program EIS/R recognized that "Inadequate natural drainage, salt accumulation, and high selenium concentrations in agricultural return flow have been long-standing problems in this area and have intensified with the importation of irrigation water from the Delta." *Id.* at 6.1-11; and,
6. Export pumping threatens compliance with federal and state law, both of which require attaining water quality objectives and recovering endangered species populations. CALFED specifically acknowledged that "[t]here is concern whether a through-Delta conveyance approach," in which water is sucked through the Bay-Delta by the South Delta pumps, "can meet future water quality objectives and not adversely affect the recovery of threatened and endangered fish species." *Id.* at ES-17.

CSPA-43

The CALFED EIR analysis confirms a common-sense notion: increasing the already-massive amount of water pumped out of a fragile aquatic ecosystem, at a time when other export-increasing projects are proposed, fish populations in that ecosystem are threatened or collapsing, and water quality already fails to meet federal and state standards, is likely to cause adverse environmental impacts. The SDIP DEIS/R's contrary conclusion is arbitrary and unreasonable given the historical facts in the Bay/Delta.

Further, the DEIS/R fails to identify and analyze a number of other existing and proposed projects that will have synergistic environmental impacts. Consequently, the DEIS/R is deficient, and should be withdrawn and revised to address and analyze these projects.

CSPA-44

CSPA-44

1. **South Delta Temporary Barriers Project.** The DEIS/R begins with the clear assumption, that project effects from the Temporary Barriers project are part of the “baseline.” As such they are not to be considered impacts of this project. However, a careful review of the environmental documentation for the Temporary Barriers project clearly identifies areas of concern that were to be studied. Examples include the effects of inundation of listed plants (such as the Mason’s lileaopsis), by the operation of the barriers, and the accumulation of avian and fish predators at the barrier sites. These impacts have occurred and are the responsibility of the Temporary Barrier’s Project to mitigate. Since the SDIP will replace the Temporary Barrier’s Project, it becomes the responsibility of the SDIP to mitigate for these impacts.
2. **City of Stockton Drinking Water Intake.** The City of Stockton is planning to construct an intake on the San Joaquin River near Potato Slough. The environmental documents for the project acknowledge entrainment and reduction of Delta outflow issues.
3. **Delta Improvement Project (DIP).** This CalFed program includes the SDIP, the Delta Cross-channel re-operation, the Through Delta Facility, the Frank’s Tract modification, the Contra Costa Water District facilities, and the increases in export capability.
4. **CVP-SWP Intertie.** A connection between the CVP’s Delta Mendota Canal and the SWP’s California Aqueduct, which will permit 300 cfs to be pumped from the CVP to the SWP, and will allow up to 900 cfs to flow from the SWP to the CVP.
5. **Joint Point of Diversion and Coordinated Operating Agreement.** This item is currently before the SWRCB, who is currently conducting a Cease and Desist Order hearing on the subject of violations of internal Delta water quality standards by the CVP and SWP.
6. **Port of Stockton Water Quality Improvement Project.** This project proposes to inject oxygen into the zone of low DO in an effort to improve the water quality. Injection of pure oxygen into the water column is likely to create super saturated conditions detrimental to fish.
7. **San Joaquin River Recirculation** – This proposed recirculation program would move Delta water south, via the Delta-Mendota Canal, to the Newman Wasteway for release into the San Joaquin River.

NEPA also does not allow project to be analyzed in artificial isolation. Instead, it requires discussion of the cumulative impacts of the proposed project in combination with “past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions.” The past direct and indirect impacts to the aquatic habitat, ecology and fishery populations from state and

federal project operations (including temporary barriers) have resulted in long-term cumulative adverse effects on present and future generations of aquatic life in the Delta. The DEIS/R is deficient for not candidly discussing project impacts on population trends for striped bass, sturgeon, American shad, Delta and long-fin smelt and other Delta species, including their food webs. Such an evaluation would encompass entrainment of all species of fish and lower trophic populations and provide an assessment of what cumulative impacts have occurred over the life of the projects and what can reasonably be expected to occur if the proposed project goes forward.

CSPA-44

VIII. The DEIS/R Improperly Relies on DSM-2 and CALSIM II, Flawed Analytical Tools that Fail to Adequately disclose the SDIP's Environmental Impacts.

The DEIS/R's analyses of water availability, environmental impacts, export and project effectiveness are predicated almost entirely on modeling output. While DSM-2 and CalSim-II may be useful tools, a complete dependence upon modeling is inappropriate as the models are incapable of providing the certainty that is required of an environmental document. Yet, throughout the DEIR/S, modeled predictions are presented as fact. There are no error bars that would indicate the range of uncertainty or accuracy (although the DEIS/R briefly admits that modeled surface elevations in the south Delta tend to be half a foot higher than actual levels). It is simply inappropriate to base major planning decisions on modeling output without discussing model resolution and probabilistic error rates.

CSPA-45

DSM-2 has never been peer reviewed and been heavily criticized. Its 2001 calibration and verification report has never been finalized and remains in an incomplete draft form. For example, DSM-2's salinity transport module is one-dimensional and has been calibrated exclusively using surface salinity. It ignores stratification and assumes that surface salinity over a channel cross-section is constant. Only a three-dimensional model can account for higher concentrations of salinity at depth, as has been documented by subsurface monitoring. Examination of the most recent verification of DSM-2 water quality modeling reveals substantial differences between actual and predicted values. For example, as previously discussed, salinity at Old River at Tracy Road 14 Day Moving Averages and 24.75 Hour Running Average Plots: 1 April 1900 through 30 September 1994 and 1 October 1994 through 30 September 1999 show substantial discrepancies; often more than 1,000 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$. <http://modeling.water.ca.gov/delta/studies/validation2000/qual-ec/rold059Avg.html>. It is clear that any claimed improvement from the project implementation is lost within the "noise" of the model. Consequently, proponent claims that the project will improve electric conductivity by a precise amount are without creditable foundation.

CALSIM II modeling is similarly flawed. CalSim II is not an accurate model design to evaluate environmental impacts of the SDIP-OCAP and it has not been sufficiently calibrated for this use. DWR and BOR have been told this by other scientists repeatedly. CalSim-II is being used in every significant water planning process now underway in California. When the outcome of a planning process like this one hinges on modeling